

Appointment

From: Cawley, Michelle [Michelle.Cawley@icfi.com]
Sent: 12/4/2015 9:44:03 PM
To: Cawley, Michelle [Michelle.Cawley@icfi.com]; Glenn, Barbara [Glenn.Barbara@epa.gov]; Galizia, Audrey [Galizia.Audrey@epa.gov]; Persad, Amanda [Persad.Amanda@epa.gov]; Cooper, Glinda [Cooper.Glinda@epa.gov]; ginger.chew@cdc.hhs.gov
Subject: Discuss reviewer comments on allergy and asthma sections of formaldehyde assessment
Attachments: Study Evaluation - Allergy Asthma - HERO Net Links-for reviewers.docx; Summary of Methods-for reviewers.docx; Synthesis - Allergy Asthma_Hero Net Links-for reviewers.docx
Location: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
Start: 1/7/2016 7:00:00 PM
End: 1/7/2016 8:30:00 PM
Show Time As: Busy

Recurrence: (none)

Files for review, include:

- 1) Summary of methods – background material to get a sense of the whole process about 14 pages, including several pages that are tables or figures, so more like 10 pages text.
- 2) Study evaluation – summarizes lit search and study evaluation methods, about 13 pages text and 20+ pages of tables
- 3) Synthesis – hazard identification section – about 10 pages text and a lot of tables and figures

Areas to provide comments on:

- **Literature search and evaluation section:** do the explanations and rationale for decisions regarding the selection of studies and evaluation of studies make sense?
 - In the selection of studies, we are interested in whether our specification of the types of outcomes we included (or excluded) makes sense
 - In the evaluation of the studies, we are interested in decisions regarding confidence in different types of outcome measures; decisions regarding relevant exposure time period for different types of outcomes; and decisions regarding other methods issues, e.g., confounding) make sense? Is there anything you disagree with, or would think about differently?
- **Agreement or disagreement with the studies we classified as “high”, “medium” or “low” confidence** (particularly the “high” and “low” confidence groups)
- **Synthesis section** – clarity; additional points to emphasize or additional analyses to conduct, does the weighing of the evidence make sense? Would you reach different conclusions?

A few other things to note:

- There are references in the material to “Section C.5.5”, which is a separate section reviewing mode of action. We have not included this in the material for your review (but could do so if you wish)
- We have completed the October 2015 updated literature search; there are a few studies to add but they do not change the discussion
- Both sections refer to a literature search diagram (Supplemental Figure C.5.3.1-1); this figure has not been created yet, so it is not included

- We have not come up with final counts of papers, so those are highlighted in yellow or noted as “XX”
- There are a few other references to add (usually noted in highlighted text)
- ICF can arrange access to articles can be made through EPA HERO (but you are not expected to read every article! Or any articles – this is just if you want to check something)